

**REMARKS**

This is a response to an Office Action mailed December 10, 2001 (Office Action). The Office Action has been reviewed, and in view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application are respectfully requested.

Attached hereto is a Petition for Extension of Time (of one month) under 37 .C.F.R §1.136(a), thereby extending the period for response to **April 10, 2002**. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this Response is timely filed.

**Personal Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner Channavajjala for the courtesies extended during the April 4, 2002 personal interview.

**Drawing Objections**

Applicants have submitted, in duplicate, a separate Letter to the Draftsperson incorporating the drawing corrections required by the Examiner. Approval for the drawing changes is respectfully requested.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 33-36 are added by this response. Claims 1-32 stand rejected for the reasons stated in the Office Action.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18, 20-26 and 28-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,778,400 (Tateno) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,648 (Halstead). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the above cited claims in view of the combination of Tateno and Halstead is improper for, at least, failing to suggest or disclose each feature recited in the claims. For example, claim 1 recites, among other things, the features of "evaluating the message by comparing the characters of the message to a predetermined set of candidate character sets to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message" and "generating a search index based on the results of the evaluation of the message and candidate character sets." At least these features are not suggested or disclosed in Tateno, Halstead, or their combination. Similarly, independent claims 9, 17 and 25 each recite similar features to the above quoted features recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the independent claims recite features that are not suggested or disclosed in the cited references. For at least this reason Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 4-8, 10, 12-16, 18, 20-24, 26 and 28-32 each depend from one of independent claims 1, 9, 17 or 25 and, therefore, contain the features recited in the independent claims. As discussed above, the cited references fail to suggest or disclose each of the features in the independent claims and, thus, necessarily fail to suggest or disclose each of the features in the dependent claims. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 4-8, 10, 12-16, 18, 20-24, 26 and 28-32 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 11, 19 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tateno, Halstead and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,192 (Houchin). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As discussed above, the combination of Tateno and Halstead fails to suggest or disclose at least the above discussed features of the independent claims. Houchin is not relied upon to disclose those features either, and, thus, fails to cure the deficiencies of the proposed combination with respect to those features. Therefore, claims 3, 11, 19 and 27 each contain the same features, recited above, that are not suggested or disclosed by the combination of Tateno, Halstead and Houchin. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 11, 19 and 27 be withdrawn.

In an effort to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have provided new claims 33-36. Each of claims 33-36 recite features of the invention not suggested or disclosed by the art of record. For example, claim 33 recites, "enabling the processor to create a mask comprising a number of mask columns equivalent to the predetermined number of columns in the character table bank, wherein the mask columns contain an indication of the character sets against which the universal code characters of the electronic message are to be evaluated ... evaluating the universal code characters of the electronic message received at the input device by accessing the corresponding character row of the character table bank for each of a predetermined number of the characters of the electronic message and performing a logical AND operation between each of the corresponding character rows and the mask; filling a character match list with an entry for each of the character sets that result in a non-zero result after the logical AND operation; returning the character match list; and enhancing the search index by indicating for each code page the character sets returned in the character match list." Claims 34-36 also recite similar features. Applicants

respectfully submit that at least these features are not suggested or disclosed by the art of record. Applicants respectfully request that claims 33-36 be allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or interview would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

It is believed that no other fees are due in connection with filing this Response. In the event that it is determined that fees are due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Attorney Docket No. 23452-091.

Respectfully submitted,

Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky and Popeo, PC

Dated: February 28, 2002

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Christopher Cuneo  
Registration No. 42,450

11911 Freedom Drive, Suite 400  
Reston, VA 20190  
Telephone (703) 464-4800  
Facsimile (703) 464-4895